

# Bill Maher Gets Owned by Glenn Greenwald Over Benghazi and Interventionism - May 10, 2013

Youtube comments [https://youtu.be/MB-itn\\_LJuM](https://youtu.be/MB-itn_LJuM)

**Bob Jones** 3 months ago

HERE is how you convince people like Maher and me to join your side, provide actual FACTS that proves the statistics and studies that Maher and Harris put forth to be false. Do that and I'm sure Maher would be happy to join your side; Harris might be tougher cuz criticisms of Islam is a larger part of his career but he is a rational guy, provide enough actual evidence and he'll cave.

**TheHowitzer9** 3 months ago

No, he doesn't. I've seen Maher and Harris confronted with facts about how many Muslims oppose those crazy laws, and how many Jews and Christians support equally horrific things and how many Christian and Jewish extremists have killed people. Point out how Christian Fundies in the West propped up these "Kill the gays" laws in Uganda and other African nations, or how Christian Fundamentalism lead to deaths of 500,000-1,000,000 Iraqis, they don't care. Point out how radical Zionists and Jewish Fundamentalists kill far more Palestinians than Muslim Fundamentalists kill Israelis, they don't care. Point out how 80% of Israelis supported the bombing of UN embassies and childrens' hospitals in Palestine, they don't care. Their mind is made up that Islam is the "worst" religion and singularly more threatening than any other. In their mind a Sunni Muslim beheading someone over apostasy or drawing Muhammad is somehow worse than African Christians killing gays and Pagans by gunshot. The Charlie Hebdo murders in their mind is somehow worse than the McVeigh bombings of synagogue and Sikh temple shootings by Christian Fundies, or killing 77 children by Andres Breivik. Why? Because the killer was Muslim, and in their mind a Muslim Fundie I'd somehow "more inspired" or believes more in their religion than Jewish and Christian Fundies. It's circular logic.

Maybe you'll change with evidence, but speak for yourself. Harris and Maher won't. They're Zionists who think Islam is the worst religion. Deaths in the name of Islam is worse to them than deaths in the name of Christianity, Judaism or Western geopolitical and economic interests. Somehow being beheaded in the name of Muhammad makes you more dead than being shot in the name of Christ or Israel. There's no reasoning with them.

**jaw444** 2 months ago (edited)

People like Maher and Harris conveniently ignore how many people are beheaded by US bombs in Iraq, Libya, some may want to forget Vietnam, it still happened, the Vietnamese can't forget it, the Iraqis can't forget it, the Libyans can't forget it, the attacks on so many people in their homelands who were no threat to Americans at all, what is that? Embarrassing history swept under the rug. We don't call it atrocity, even though it is.

Maher, Harris, many Americans, don't think about what happens when bombs hit you, your head gets blown off, brains splatter, bodies blown in half, guts spilling out, the screams, the agony, but since you aren't going to see this in US "information" media, while seeing the videos of the much smaller number of beheadings by the Islamic militants, people like Maher conclude that the Islamists are barbaric (Islamists who would gladly bomb people from the air if they had the technology, they have their own kind of shock and awe). In Maher's mind, whatever Americans have done, it's not in the same class. Sure, we kill, mainly in self defense, we don't really want to kill, and sometimes we make a mistake, "collateral damage," calculated risk, it's all so civilized and well intended, they force us to do it because they are

so evil and pose huge, if undefined, threat and only the vaguest suggestions of what victory would look like.

It was a different video when Maher and Harris were arguing that Islam is a threat to liberalism. Affleck and Christoff were saying that given the many Muslims who don't share the unliberal beliefs Maher said were threatened, Maher's and Harris's position was racist. Maher cited a Pew poll in which 86% of Egyptian Muslims said they believed that leaving Islam should be punished by death, based on their sample. Actually Maher "rounded" the number up to 90%, which for me, says a lot about his credibility, but that's just me. Personally, I'm like, why not be accurate, maybe the true number is closer to 80%? Why cheat? Lying is cheating, I listen to people do it on Fox every day, changing numbers and other facts in ways that promote their agenda.

The Pew result is probably accurate for Egypt. The voters there, in their first free and fair election after years under dictators, did elect the Muslim Brotherhood party to run the country, and the Muslim Brotherhood is a fundamentalist organization. That elected government was violently overthrown by a military dictatorship, large numbers of Muslim Brotherhood supporters were killed and imprisoned. History has shown (I can give abundant examples) that such repression will strengthen fundamentalism in such societies. The previous regime, under Mubarek, was a dictatorship and police state and that has everything to do with why the Muslim Brotherhood was the most popular group in the society. Liberal people who consider that to be a problem should be asking why that is, and looking carefully for answers, not jumping to conclusions based on fear and prejudice.

What was racist about Maher's and Harris's interpretation of the poll results was that they concluded from the examples of Muslim majority countries where majorities believed in death for apostasy, that this proved that Islam is "a motheload of bad ideas," as Harris said. To conclude this, they have to ignore that the poll found this belief in some Muslim majority countries and not others, and that there was a pattern contributing to an explanation of why Muslims believe one way in one country and a different way in another country. In particular is that the belief was stronger in less modernized countries, and in countries that lived under autocratic rule. The countries that were more modernized and more culturally diverse had few people accepting that belief. It reminds me of the history of Christianity and how it was interpreted in much more backward violent ways before modernization, and in less modernized Christian societies today, such as Ethiopia and Eritrea. Today, most Christian countries are modernized and therefore have secular government and culture. Many Islamic countries are not modernized and have more religious governments culture.

The racist part of Maher's conclusions and assertions about this is the complete lack of curiosity about what could explain this, on the contrary, Maher and Harris were very dismissive of the data showing that more modernized and diverse Muslim majority countries scored low on the belief about apostasy, as if it wasn't important, date which was not important to them, obviously, data which was collected in the same way as the data they wanted to use to justify their conclusions.

People committed to bigotry do not have their minds changed by facts. If it were possible to change their minds with fact, they wouldn't be bigoted in the first place, they would know better than to think so simplistically, they would be interested in true explanations of things they don't understand. People who are impatient with complexity, like Bill O'Reilly and Bill Maher, do not have trustworthy ideas, though they have the platform to push them on the public.

Of course, Westerners have many enemies who are fundamentalist Islamists. I recommend listening to some of what Michael Scheuer has to say on You Tube in interviews, he was the

CIA head of the bin Laden unit under the Clinton and Bush administrations, he was in charge of finding and killing bin Laden for many years and he has more expertise than most Westerners about militant Islamic fundamentalism. He does not think the Islamists started the fight with the Westerners, but the other way around, though he is patriotic and has served as an agent of the West. But he sees the ignorance of the West about their enemy has being disastrous for Western interests. He quit the CIA to speak out about this.

If liberals were really interested in solutions for a safer world, they would want to learn a lot more than they obviously know, which isn't much. They would look at the role of the US and other Western countries in destroying and undermining the more progressive secular Arab governments because those governments were not cooperative with supporting the Western interests, not that they were posing threats to the US or European homelands, but just that they wanted to use their oil for their own national interests. When the Western countries still were still exercising classical colonial rule over Arab countries and Iran, their interests in having control over Arab oil reserves was strong and determined.

So many examples of secular and progressive Arab governments destroyed by the US. The first one I know much about was Iran's first popularly elected government in the early 1950s. It was a parliamentary multiparty system, the whole diverse society was represented in the legislature, everyone had a voice, religious fundamentalists, communists, liberals, all working together, under the leadership of the secular nationalist prime minister (Mossadegh). Mossadegh and his government were committed to the rule of law, explicitly, they were idealist and the government wanted to improve the lives of Iranians, most of who were very poor. The leadership knew that if the country was going to progress culturally (secularism) it had to progress economically.

Up to that time, the British had a colonial-like relationship with Iran, owning and controlling and reaping the profits from their oil industry. The oil company owned by the British is today called British Petroleum. The Iranians, even before the new nationalist elected government, had tried to negotiate a more fair deal with the British, the Iranians wanted a 50/50 split on oil profits, which was the deal the British gave the Saudis. But the British weren't willing to give up what they had in Iran. So, Mossadegh with strong support of all parties and the general population, nationalized the Iranian oil industry, taking Iranian ownership of it. They still wanted to negotiate a fair deal with the British, but the British refused. The British instituted a blockade against Iran so they couldn't sell any oil, and they pulled all their technical experts out so Iran wouldn't have the ability to run their oil industry.

But the Iranian people were so strongly in support of owning their own oil and not being in a colonial situation, they continued to support Mossadegh despite the cost to the Iranian economy. Mossadegh wanted to use revenue from the oil to build the Iranian infrastructure and education and health care system and make Iran a modern country. This of course, would have had the same effect modernization has in any society, religion becomes less useful and becomes watered down. Modern countries become secular countries. That was the leadership Mossadegh intended to provide. Time Magazine picked him as Man of the Year, putting him on the cover, beating out General MacArthur and Dean Acheson among others.

The British were so badly weakened by WWII, they didn't have the power to go into Iran militarily and take "their" oil back, so they went to the US, which was not weakened by WWII. The Truman administration refused to help them in asserting the colonial power but the Eisenhower administration agreed, under militarist John Foster Dulles and his brother, CIA chief Allen Dulles. The reason I know all of this is because under the Freedom of Information Act, the very detailed and long (but readable) CIA written documentary history was declassified and was published in the year 2000 in the New York Times. There is still a lot of info about it on the web but it was hard for me to find the actual CIA document recently, I

only found one link to it. I'll include it below, for people who want to find out why Islamic fundamentalism gains power in some societies--where it is helpful to a lot of people in their daily lives (providing social services to the poor in poor countries and religious counseling where there is no secular government providing services).

What the explicit story in the CIA document is of is the US, mostly through the CIA, using violence, trickery, black ops and a lot of US tax dollars to create a military overthrow of the Iranian popular elected secular government based on rule of law, the CIA allied with one general in the Iranian military and made him part of the plan. Their ultimate plan was to install the Shah of Iran in power as the autocratic ruler of an Iranian police state. The Shah was jetsetting in Italy, having fled Iran when it became more progressive, He was afraid to come back to Iran because of how hated he was there by most of the people. That is who the US used force to put into power over Iran.

The Shah refused to come back, he was scared, but the CIA promised his safety, which they would insure by continuing the military dictatorship to repress the widespread opposition and support for the elected government the US destroyed. The CIA's plan which they carried out, was to create a powerful brutal secret police force, SAVAK, which was compared as worse than the KGB for its ruthlessness, terrorizing and totalitarian reach (globally, they went all over the world after opponents of the US regime in Iran).

The US meant serious business about retaking control of that oil. Their pretext was that the Iran elected government was 'likely to fall behind the Iron Curtain,' (can you hear the voice of John Foster Dulles there?). Americans created the SAVAK (Iranian secret police), H. Norman Schwarzkopf Sr was put at the head of the project of recruiting, training and funding the SAVAK. (father of the desert storm general). (Mossadeq was kept under house arrest for about 15 years until his death because it was feared if he were free, he would still be popular and thus, a threat to the Shah's autocracy).

Once SAVAK was up and running and the Shah could safely return, an American was put in charge of SAVAK, it couldn't be entrusted to Iranians. the Americans wanted to terrorize and oppress the Iranian population in pursuit of their objective of controlling the country for their benefit and that of Western Europe. That is what they did. The Americans aren't about democracy and liberalism. Look at their real track record. Don't let them play you. An American ran SAVAK ("worse than the KGB") for about 10 years, and then, its mission accomplished, the opposition terrorized into submission, an Iranian was put in charge. This is serious shit.

It took the Iranians about 27 years to overthrow the Shah and the Americans, and thanks to what the Americans did to their country, destroying their secular government and secular factions in the society, the only group left with any organization and cohesion was the religious people, led by the Ayatollahs. They suffered badly under the Shah/Americans, imprisoned and killed, but they only got stronger in their underground organization and their bond with the people at large. They had their faith to hold them together through all of that. In that context, religion had value and usefulness. They were into martyrdom. That gave them the power they needed to survive and eventually to win. It's too bad the US destroyed their chance to have a secular government succeed in protecting the people of the country. The Iranians really tried to have a secular country. The world's supposedly greatest "democracy" destroyed their freedom and political rights. They finally through off US rule in the late 70s and ever since the US has been very mad, loss of control of Iranian oil reserves again. They put Iran on their hit list which they are working their way through, ("axis of evil"). Iraq, Libya, Iran, Syria.

Americans like Maher seem to have no clue about any of this, that the Americans could have any responsibility for why Iran doesn't have a secular government based on secular laws. But the facts of history are that the US violently overthrew a secular elected parliamentary government in Iran because they nationalized their oil. Pure and simple. I included a link to the CIA history of Operation Ajax below.

Iran has never violently invaded and occupied other countries. The US and its allies have done this again and again. The US is the worst offender, the most violent, the most trigger happy. How dare Maher and Harris talk about bad Islamic ideas. First face yourself in the mirror and what you have supported and tolerated and minimized the harm of, what your supposedly liberal government has caused to happen, deliberately, not by accident. Give up the double standard. Then you will be honest and fair and truly liberal.

Maher wants to say that Islam is a problem for liberalism. He shows his ignorance of a lot of history. The US did virtually the same thing in Iraq, destroyed a stable secular government and modernizing progressing society, replacing it with fundamentalist Shi'ite (pro-Iranian Ayatollah) rulers, and destroyed a beautiful country that before the US atrocity, had the highest standard of living of any Arab country, this brutal attack on people who posed no threat to the US, based on elaborate lies, same track record. US violence and destruction forced a couple million Iraqis to become refugees, with nowhere to go except Syria and Jordan, imposing a terrible burden on those countries, and then when the limit of that was reached, a lot of these people moved on to Western Europe, I can't even imagine what it would be like to be forced from my home where I have lived all my life, to lose everything, my family, my connections, my enjoyments, my culture, and to have settle in foreign lands where I don't speak the language. Of course, I will seek out people who came from my country and form communities with them, all of us shell shocked and heartbroken, but needing to raise our children and help them to know some happiness. I can't imagine having to go through that. Why is my country doing this to innocent people who have done nothing against my country? Why is war not a last resort that you take in self defense only? That's what I taught as child.

liberals are complaining about the effect of Muslim communities in Western Europe, yet WTF do you expect?? The US did the same thing in Libya, they took a modernizing secular government and bombed it to death, creating a vacuum and arming and empowering Islamic fundamentalists, and now, Libya has anarchy where Islamic fundamentalists are the most powerful faction, and ISIS has spread over there. Well, what did you expect?? How dare these people destroy the governments of other people, just because they have the power? People who aren't threatening Americans or anyone else? Lying about the reasons why they're doing it. Kadafi who they killed apparently was changing over to not accepting petro dollars and wanted Libyan oil paid for in gold. Apparently that was what his death sentence was for. Now, these people, these "liberals," are are doing it in Syrian, destroying another secular government that isn't threatening Americans, determined to replace it with "moderate rebels," like in Libya, right? Syria's leader Assad and his government were succeeding in retaking territory from ISIS, but the US and Saudis and allies undermined that success by arming and recruiting and training so called "moderate rebels" to fight Assad on other fronts, helping ISIS to take over more parts of Syria. Does Bill Maher care? Does he want to learn about this and where the main problem lies, and it's not Islam. Those people were all modernizing when the US destroyed their governments and put fundamentalists in power. So get real, stop being played.

This makes me very mad, especially when I hear Americans complain about "the rise of Islamic fundamentalism, oh what shall we do? How can we fix these bad people, should we have troops on the ground or should we just bomb?" Every successful bombing is a beheading. There is ALWAYS "collateral damage." Assholes. Moral equivalence?? NO. The US has killed and maimed far more people than the Islamic fundamentalists have. That is a

fact. No one is keep statistics in war zones like Iraq and Libya, but anyone with common sense and eyes open who is curious about what is going on can easily see how much easier it is to kill more people when you have the power to go to war wherever you want, and you do it, over and over, destroying societies as you go. But to know that, you have to not be ego-identified with US patriotism because that causes tragic blindness. I'm sorry the US does these things. I wish it wasn't true. But it makes me mad when they create conditions to empower militant Islamists and then whine about it on the media as if these evil religious people came out of nowhere. It really makes me mad.

<http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/05/28/which-countries-still-outlaw-apostasy-and-blasphemy/>

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/172952191/CIA-Clandestine-Service-History-Overthrow-of-Premier-Mossadeq-of-Iran-November-1952-August-1953-March-1954-by-Dr-Donald-Wilber#scribd>

**Towelz** 2 months ago

+**TheHowitzer9** Are you Glenn Greenwald because that argument was God Tier my friend. Seriously, you should be on Real Time.

**Superman13195** 3 weeks ago

+**jaw444** I have to disagree with your use of the word "liberal". I think most liberals are against Islamophobic discrimination compared to conservatives.

---

**randomflashbacks** 2 months ago (edited)

Red Herring fallacy. Nothing more. While much of what Greenwald says is true, it's irrelevant to the conversation. All he's doing is changing the subject and using America's faults as an excuse for Islamic extremism.

**aadu7ec** 1 month ago

Well they do, just one example that Joy Reid mentioned in Iran, they had a stable government with Mossadegh, yet to favour british oil policies they took him out, and installed the Sha, who stood up and took him out well Khomeini did, who was a radical religious leader, granted he was no better than the Sha, and in no way am I excusing him, as it wasn't a greater good replacing evil, he was just the one who stood up to him. it wouldn't have happened if the US minded their own business.